



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	------------------

09/139,705 08/25/98 MARTIN

EXAMINER 3273.20

KENT S BURNINGHAM  
TRASK BRITT & ROSSA  
230 SOUTH 500 EAST  
SUITE 300  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84102

QM12/0119

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER  
STRIGHT, R 12

DATE MAILED:

01/19/00

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/25/99

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 24-42 is/are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
☒ Claim(s) 24-42 is/are rejected.  
☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.  
☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.  
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.  
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).  
☒ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.  
☒ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 07/288,364  
☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892  
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413  
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

-SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES-

Art Unit: 3762

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 24-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 24 and 39, the “free distal tip” of the inner tube lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 30, the thickness of the wall of the inner tube and the thickness of the wall of the outer tube lacks antecedent basis. It appears that this claim should depend from claim 29 and not claim 28.

In claim 34, the “area of the transverse cross section of the first lumen” lacks antecedent basis. It is also unclear what this means. It appears that this is to be the second and third lumens and not the first and the second because no such disclosure could be found in the specification or the drawings.

### ***Double Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or

Art Unit: 3762

improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 24-42 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-33 of U. S. Patent No. 5, 195,962; over claims 1-23 of U. S. Patent No. 5,797,869 and over claim 1 of U. S. Patent No. 5,472,417 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: All the patents and the current application are directed to a triple lumen catheter having inner and outer tubes connected by a septum that splits the area between the two tubes into two lumens. Also, the language "comprising" as found in the patented claims affords coverage for the now claimed size limitations, etc. that are associated with the claimed embodiment of the catheter.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Art Unit: 3762

***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Stright whose telephone number is (703) 308-2113. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm.

The Official Fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3590. All formal faxes must go to this number. The art unit fax phone number is (703) 306-4520. All informal faxes may be sent to this number.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

rs

January 4, 2000

  
RONALD STRIGHT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER